

УДК 94 (477) “18”

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.32589/2412-9321.29.2024.301821>

M. S. GEDIN

Kyiv National Linguistic University, Ukraine

e-mail: maksym.hedin@knlu.edu.ua

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5031-8207>

## OPPOSING OF THE IDEAS OF SLAVOFILISM IN THE HISTORICAL AND SOCIO-POLITICAL VIEWS OF V. B. ANTONOVYCH

### Abstract

The purpose of the study is to consider the contest and basic ideas of the public activity of the outstanding historian of XIX century V.B.Antonovych, with supporters of slavophilism as well as his struggle for the free development of Ukrainian statehood, language and literature in the Russian Empire in the second half of the XIXth century. **The methodology** is based on the use of a microhistorical approach. At the same time, the principles of objectivity, systematization and scientificity are applied. The chronological method, the method of analysis and synthesis, as well as comparative and retrospective methods were used. **Scientific novelty.** Based on the analysis of the scientific heritage of V. B. Antonovych, it was established that the scientist tried to actively oppose the views of Slavophiles and perceived Ukrainian identity as having historical, spiritual and cultural origins since the early Middle Ages. In this way, V. B. Antonovych formed convictions about the need to preserve Ukrainian national traditions, establish national consciousness, replenish the spiritual arsenal of the Ukrainian nation with the cultural achievements of world civilization. **Conclusions.** The essential features and socio-cultural factors of the formation of V. B. Antonovych's Ukrainianness in the difficult conditions of the revival of the Ukrainian nation in the second half of the 19th century are revealed. Through the prism of scientific and journalistic confrontation with supporters of Slavophilism, the ethno-political views of the scientist on the essential features, as well as the nature and content of the relationship between the Ukrainian and Russian nations, are analyzed. It was determined that V. B. Antonovych constantly proved to Slavophiles that Ukrainians are a separate, self-sufficient people with their own history, language and culture, and the scientist considered any unification of Ukraine with Muscovy as a misfortune for Ukraine and a source of its national oppression. The conditions and channels of the spread of the Ukrainian national idea by V.B.Antonovych in society are considered, the specifics of its interpretation by an outstanding historian are shown.

**Key words:** V.B.Antonovych, Ukrainian national idea, ukrainstkost, revival of Ukrainian nation, school of historians, state formation.

## ПРОТИСТОЯННЯ ІДЕЯМ СЛОВ'ЯНОФІЛЬСТВА В ІСТОРИЧНИХ І СУСПІЛЬНО-ПОЛІТИЧНИХ ПОГЛЯДАХ В. Б. АНТОНОВИЧА

### Анотація

Метою дослідження є представлення змісту та ідейних основ науково-публіцистичної боротьби одного з найвідоміших істориків та громадського діяча XIX століття В.Б.Антоновича із прихильниками слов'янофільства за право вільного розвитку української державності, мови та літератури в Росії в другій половині XIX століття. **Методологія** ґрунтується на використанні мікроісторичного підходу. При цьому застосовуються принципи об'єктивності, систематизації та науковості. Використано хронологічний метод, метод аналізу та синтезу, а також порівняльний та ретроспективний методи. **Наукова новизна.** На основі аналізу наукової спадщини В.Б.Антоновича було встановлено, що вчений намагався активно протистояти поглядам слов'янофілів і сприймав українську самобутність,

як таку, що має історико-духовні та культурні витoki з часів раннього середньовіччя. Таким чином у В.Б.Антоновича формувалися переконання щодо необхідності збереження українських національних традицій, утвердження національної свідомості, поповнення духовного арсеналу української нації культурними здобутками світової цивілізації. **Результати дослідження.** Розкрито сутнісні риси та соціокультурні чинники формування українськості В.Б.Антоновича в складних умовах відродження української нації в другій половині XIX століття. Крізь призму науково-публіцистичного протистояння з прихильниками слов'янофільства, проаналізовано етнополітичні погляди вченого на сутнісні риси, а також характер і зміст взаємовідносин української та російської націй. Визначено, що В.Б.Антонович постійно доводив слов'янофілам, що українці є окремим, самодостатнім народом із власною історією, мовою та культурою, а будь-яке об'єднання України з Московією вчений вважав за нещастя для України і джерело її національного гноблення. Розглянуто умови та канали поширення української національної ідеї В.Б.Антоновичем у суспільстві, показано специфіку її трактовки видатним істориком.

**Ключові слова:** В.Б.Антонович, українська національна ідея, українськість, відродження української нації, школа істориків, державотворення.

**Introduction.** In the mid-nineteenth century, historical science in Ukraine became the basis of national consciousness and the development of the national movement. At that time, intellectuals who resisted Russian assimilation by studying various aspects of Slavic studies were engaged in the study, comprehension, and analysis of Ukrainian history. In the context of Russia's current full-scale war against the Ukrainian state, the personality of Volodymyr Antonovych, a professor at St. Volodymyr's University of Kyiv, is of interest. January 6 marked the 190th anniversary of the birth of this prominent national cultural and public figure of the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, who, in the face of severe persecution of Ukrainophiles in a hostile imperial state, took the position of a conscious and active defender of Ukrainian history and culture, a responsible leader of the Ukrainian cultural and political movement.

It should be noted that the Ukrainian national and cultural revival was significantly influenced by both the Western European worldview concepts of the time and intellectual trends and phenomena alternative to the European orientation, which also influenced the formation of the socio-political views of XIXth century Ukrainian scholars (Kruglashov, 2000, p. 96). In particular, we are talking about Slavophilism, which was formed on the basis of Romanticism, as well as the socio-political and historical views of V. B. Antonovych.

Slavophilism is a complex historical and philosophical phenomenon that, on the one hand, looks like a set of different ideas and aspirations, and on the other hand, a new literary movement and trend in socio-political, philosophical, and theological thought that received this name in the early 40s of the XIX century. Until the early 70s of the nineteenth century, it underwent transformations and was reflected in the theories of other nationalities of the Slavic world: Ukrainians, Czechs, Poles, and others. It did not develop into an organic doctrine, but had only ideologues whose views could be radically opposed. Instead, today, along with Europeanization, there is a need to engage more in Ukrainianization, which means that the East-West dilemma studied by Slavophiles is extremely relevant today. Therefore, studying the essence of the debates between Ukrainian intellectuals and Slavophiles can contribute to cultural and educational policy in Ukraine.

In the context of globalization, which encompasses not only the economy but also the spiritual and cultural sphere, Slavic peoples seek to preserve their cultural and national identity. At the same time, the military aggression against Ukraine, which began in 2014 and led to the violation of the territorial integrity of our state, gives reason to see this as a hidden echo of the Slavophile doctrine, which in the last quarter of the nineteenth century

became the basis for the foreign policy ambitions of the autocracy. Therefore, the study of the problem of Slavophilism and its varieties is a demand of the times.

The ideology of Slavophilism had supporters in Ukraine who sought to prove the national identity of Ukrainians, their right to study in their native language, and their right to an independent state life. By analogy to the Slavophiles, they were called Ukrainophiles, and the movement itself was called Ukrainophilism. With the intensification of the Ukrainian national movement in the 60s and 70s, the issue of language as the main identifier of the nation became important in their activities. In this phase of the struggle against the neglect of the cultural and national interests of Ukrainians, Volodymyr Antonovych launched an active scientific and journalistic activity.

The relevance of the study of the influence and reflection of the ideas of Slavophilism in the historical and socio-political views of V. B. Antonovych lies in the attempt to provide a fair assessment of the diverse activities of the scientist in the Ukrainian dimension, which will help to comprehend the significance of his work for the formation of the ethno-state-building process in Ukraine. An important task seems to be to show through the prism of the spread of Slavophilism V. B. Antonovych's understanding of the causes of the Ukrainian-Russian political division, which, according to the scholar, had historical, spiritual and cultural origins in the early Middle Ages.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** The national context of V. B. Antonovych's work and scientific heritage has turned out to be the most fundamental object of disagreement between the representatives of different ideological trends in historical science. The historiography of the Ukrainian diaspora has shown excessive skepticism towards V. B. Antonovych's key thesis on the history of Ukraine "statelessness as an immanent feature of the Ukrainian people", shifting the scope of its research to a general overview of his work based on exaggerating the role of national motivation. Accordingly, it is quite obvious that only by taking into account the ideological basis of the historian's scientific heritage, carried out without any ideological bias, can we approach an objective characterization of the entire wide range of his work and determine the place and role of V. B. Antonovych in the Ukrainian historiography of the second half of the nineteenth – early twentieth centuries (Kiyani, 2011, p.223).

The historiography of Slavophilism is diverse in terms of subjects and time of research, as the views of Slavophiles were critically analyzed with varying degrees of activity: pre-revolutionary historiography, consisting not only of monographs but also of many journal articles; the decline of scientific interest in Soviet times until the 70s of the twentieth century.

In particular, the milestones of the scientist's life and work are reflected in one of the volumes of the Encyclopedia of the History of Ukraine (2003).

Among contemporary researchers, we should note the monograph by O. Kiyani (2005), which reveals V. B. Antonovych's historiosophical views on Ukrainian history and studies the factors that influenced the formation of the scientist's scientific outlook. Instead, the monograph by Y. Vermenych (2010) examines the influence of the intellectual environment, in particular, scientific and journalistic discourses, on the processes of national self-determination of the Ukrainian ethnos. In general, these monographs examine the dynamics of public opinion from positivism to the formulation of a national ideal. The most significant works that study the life and work of V. B. Antonovych (Ulyanovsky & Korotkyi, 1997) analyze in detail his social and political activities and creative heritage. At the same time, V. B. Antonovych's discussions with the ideologists of Slavophilism are covered in historiography only fragmentarily.

**The purpose of the article** is to analyze the views of V. B. Antonovych as a counterweight to Slavophilism, to highlight the scholar's journalistic statements on the national identity

of Ukrainians and their right to independent cultural and historical development, including education in their native language.

To achieve this goal, **the following tasks are set:** to analyze the state of scientific research on the problem; to identify the factors that influenced the formation of V. B. Antonovych as a statesman historian; to show through the prism of the spread of Slavophilism V. B. Antonovych's understanding of the causes of the Ukrainian-Russian political division.

**Methods and methodology of the study.** The methodological basis of the work is based on the principles of historicism and objectivity, which allow us to study the environment, cultural and political conditions in which V. B. Antonovych acted, to identify internal and external components that influenced the formation of his views. The methodology is based on a microhistorical approach. The principles of objectivity, systematization, and scientificity are applied. In addition, the methodology is based on the deconstruction and reinterpretation of the texts of ego-documents and a systematic combination of individual biographical, subjective, and social-typological approaches in determining V. B. Antonovych's place in the process of politicization of the Ukrainian movement.

**Presentation and discussion of the main research material.** V. B. Antonovych was one of the leading figures of the community movement in Naddniproshchyna Ukraine in the 1860s and 1890s, whose ideology was based on key elements of the Ukrainian national myth: the idea of their nation as a peasant, democratic one, they considered themselves descendants of the glorious Cossacks and hetmans. Asserting the independence and identity of Ukrainians, the scientist researched Ukrainian history, studying the peculiarities of the life of the Ukrainian people since ancient times.

V. B. Antonovych continued a peculiar tradition among national historians who felt the need not only for cultural but also for public service to their people, initiated by M. Maksymovych and M. Kostomarov. Contemporary researchers rightly note that V. B. Antonovych was not an armchair scholar, but rather took an active part in the political life of the Ukrainian people, and his civic activity began in his student years (Korduba, 1928, p. 161–162).

At the same time, the scientist began his public activities when, in 1861, he became the head of the Kyiv community, which became the main center of national, cultural, social, and political activity in Ukraine. At that time, the scientist was convinced of the low cultural and ideological level of the vast majority of Ukrainians, so he temporarily postponed familiarizing the people with ideological and political ideas. Instead, V. Antonovych encouraged community members to publish Ukrainian literature, study the life, traditions, customs, and folklore of the Ukrainian people (Son of Ukraine, 1997, p. 27). Historian Borys Krupnytskyi emphasized: "V. B. Antonovych is not a type of revolutionary, but rather a cultural progressive, a folklorist and a democrat with the idea of democratic equality and political freedom. He was close to Kostomarov in his folklorist outlook, but their ideological foundations were different: the romantic was replaced by a realist in Antonovych. He was not a revolutionary, but a very stubborn and hardy person with a huge supply of energy, with the ability to systematically approach matters and organize them well, and most importantly, with an independent mind, with the ability to find his own way" (1959, p. 91). According to the scholar, it was through the Kyiv community that V. B. Antonovych controlled the Ukrainian political and cultural movement within the Russian Empire. In addition, we note that the Ukrainian scholar played an important role among Galicians, trying to "win for Eastern Galicia the position of the Ukrainian Piedmont, a spiritual homeland for the entire Ukrainian nation" (right there, p. 92).

Despite the lack of blood ties to the Ukrainian people, V. B. Antonovych's undoubted merit to Ukraine was his clear national orientation, which was formed gradually – from his interest in the life of peasants during his travels in Ukraine as a boyhood friend to the organization of the Kyiv community. V. B. Antonovych was one of the first Ukrainian historians to come up with the concept of Ukrainian national and cultural identity. It was he who introduced the term “Ukraine-Rus” into scientific circulation, which was developed by his student M.S. Hrushevsky into a historiosophical concept (Korduba, 1928, p. 163).

In the course of his debates with Slavophiles, V. B. Antonovych actually initiated a new national-democratic concept of the history of Ukraine. The scientist substantiated the thesis of community, equality, and democracy in Ukrainian society as a leading feature of the historical process in Ukraine. In contrast to the Slavophiles, who argued for the existence of a special Russian civilization that differs in its laws of development from other Christian countries and peoples, V. Antonovych convincingly proved the originality of the centuries-old history of the Ukrainian people.

As you know, the Slavophiles of the XIXth century. considered Ukrainians not as an independent people, but as a special variety of the “Great Russians”, that is, the Russian people. Instead, V.B.Antonovych, asserting the independence and identity of Ukrainians, researched Ukrainian history, studying in it the peculiarities of the life of the Ukrainian people from the earliest times. The scientist paid great attention to educational and cultural work to preserve the national heritage, the Ukrainian language and protect the identity of Ukrainians.

It should be noted that, being under the constant strict control of tsarism and suffering anonymous accusations from his opponents, which came to the police and gendarmerie, V. B. Antonovych was forced to lead a double life, and in his scientific journalism he was neutral towards Slavophiles (Figurny`j, 2008, p. 109). At the same time, in conversations with his colleagues and students, the scientist could express his true beliefs. On this occasion, the outstanding Ukrainian scientist and politician Serhii Yefremov wrote: “The walls of the historic house on the corner of Kuznechnaya and Zhilyanskaya saw in themselves meetings of representatives of all Ukraine, and student general meetings, and quiet meetings of the central body, which then issued directives to the communities and managed their work. Here, V. B. Antonovych was truly a “man of the Soviets”, and often even the most complicated cases found a happy ending when Antonovych touched them with his clear, sober mind, consistent logic and ability to simply approach the most difficult tasks” (Yefremov, 1925, p. 10–11).

Ukrainian public and political activist, writer and publicist Oleksandr Lototsky emphasized that V. B. Antonovych was “a real and far-sighted politician, for which he was served by both natural talent, historical experience of a scientist, and a thoughtful opinion on current events. Regarding the prospects of the Ukrainian cause, V. B. Antonovych had a clear idea that the colossus, not supported by the good will of the masses, must fall; but until that moment it is necessary to hide the maximum of Ukrainian national strength, to develop that strength at least culturally, if not politically” (1933, p. 172–173).

At the beginning of the XXth century Ukrainian intellectuals launched a mass campaign for the cancellation of anti-Ukrainian tsarist decrees. At that time, with the support of Slavophiles, the Ukrainian language acquired the status of almost the most important enemy of the Russian Empire, and the imperial identity categorically continued to aggressively deny the identity of the national language of Ukrainians. In this context, the work of V. B. Antonovych regarding the restrictions on the free use of the Ukrainian language by the Russian autocracy is indicative (Figurny, 2008, p. 117).



In addition, back in the 50s of the XIXth century. V. B. Antonovych participated in the Polish national liberation movement, but later focused on the problems of the Ukrainian people. The scientist's final break with the Polish socio-political movement took place in 1859, when its representatives expressed the idea of first restoring Poland within the borders of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth of 1772, and only then solving Ukrainian problems. In response, V. B. Antonovych resigned from the editorial board of the Polish magazine "Publicysta". The external manifestation of the break with the Poles was the transition to the Orthodox faith, which symbolized in the eyes of the young scientist the final union with the Ukrainian people (Corduba, 1928, p. 162–163).

Analyzing the influence of his life path on the formation of his own personality, V. B. Antonovych emphasized that he was born in Ukraine as a nobleman and for a long time shared the class and national prejudices of the Poles against the Ukrainian people. However, later the scientist reassessed his values. It is known that in the mid-nineteenth century, the Poles, preparing for attempts to free themselves from Russian rule, tried to attract former associates. Therefore, on the eve of the Polish national liberation uprising of 1863–1864, local intellectuals, represented by A. Mioduszewski, appealed to V. B. Antonovych for cooperation. Instead, V. B. Antonovych emphasized: "Your case will have a fatal outcome. The best of you will die or be exiled or move to the West. The worst element will remain, and it will no longer be able to resist. Our cause will only benefit when the stronger of our two enemies is destroyed" (Antonovych, 1995, p. 283). The scientist realized that he had to serve the people among whom he lived, and therefore refused to participate in the preparation of the Polish January 1863 uprising, "stating that this uprising does not bode well for the Ukrainian masses, because it is conducted under old non-democratic slogans, that the place of every true son of the local land is not in the Polish noble camp, but among the Ukrainian peasantry, to whom this uprising is alien and unnecessary" (right there, p. 284).

Subsequently, as a result of the Polish uprising, the Russian autocracy intensified its struggle against the Polish and Ukrainian resistance. Accusations of separatism were made, Osnova and Sunday schools were closed, and community activities were temporarily suspended. On the other hand, the lack of opportunities to engage in public activities stimulates V. B. Antonovych to intensify his scientific work (Antonovych, 1991, p. 8-9).

As noted by contemporary Ukrainian historian V.I. Ulyanovsky, in late 1890 the idea of reconciliation between Galician Ukrainians and Poles for joint actions in the Austrian parliament emerged (Son of Ukraine, 1997, p. 51). In Kyiv, the idea was supported by O. Konysky and V. Antonovych, and the idea of a Shevchenko Society with its eventual transformation into the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences was also raised. To this end, in late 1890 and early 1891 V. B. Antonovych was on a scientific mission abroad, where he tried to implement an agreement between Galician people's representatives and Polish-Austrian political circles. He visited Lviv, Krakow, Prague, Vienna, Graz, Leibas, Zagreb, Pest, and Belgrade, but his hopes for success proved to be in vain, as neither Galicians nor the Hromadovists accepted the idea.

V. B. Antonovych really made a lot of efforts to intensify the Ukrainian movement in Galicia in the last third of the nineteenth century. In particular, he was among the Naddniprians who helped to restore the Lviv magazine Pravda in April 1872, supported the founding of the Shevchenko Society in Lviv in 1873, and in the early 1990s – its transformation into a scientific society. Personally, V. B. Antonovych received funds raised by the Naddniprians to support the publishing activities of the Galician People's Movement, especially after the Ems Decree, in particular, for the publication of the Pravda magazine (Raikivskyi, 2016, p. 76).

V. B. Antonovych constantly monitored the peculiarities of the national movement in Galicia. He was among the Dnieper community activists (along with M. Drahomanov, K. Mykhalchuk, M. Lysenko, F. Vovk, O. Rusov, P. Chubynsky, and others, 31 people in total) who signed the “Open Letter from Ukraine” sent to the editorial board of the Lviv Pravda in 1873 (Drahomanov, 1970, p. 106). The letter “to the Galician community,” in particular, criticized the political program of the Russophile movement represented by the Russian Council in Lviv, which “is unworthy of the Galician-Russian people” (Raikivsky, 2016, p. 76).

After the Ems Decree of 1876, the national movement declined, as most Hromadivists withdrew from active work, and those who continued to work had a narrow cultural and educational focus. V. B. Antonovych was one of the leaders of the “old” Hromadovites, who advocated “apolitical culturalism,” dissociated themselves from political issues, and sought to shape Ukrainian national consciousness in a legal way, to the extent that it was officially permitted. At the same time, the successes of the Narodovtsi in Galicia under the slogan of “organic labor” were an attractive contrast to the anti-Ukrainian repressions of the tsarist regime in Russia. Galicians successfully developed the national movement in the 1880s in the context of political freedoms in Austria-Hungary, while the participation of the Naddniprians in the movement faded into the background, and personal misunderstandings often arose between Ukrainian figures on both sides of the Austro-Russian border. There was still a lack of information about the Naddniprians among Galicians, and the local press rarely provided information about the Ukrainian movement in Russia. For example, the editor of Dilo, I. Beley, wrote to M. Drahomanov in December 1888 with regret that the journal published articles “about Bulgarians and Serbs, but not about Ukraine, because somehow we have not been able to establish such relations with anyone in Ukraine to ensure continuous periodic reports ... on the movement and life there” (Mudryi, 2003, p. 141–142).

In the late 1880s, the issue of establishing a department of Ukrainian history at Lviv University under the leadership of V. Antonovych was considered. The opening of a “department of world history with special emphasis on the history of Eastern Europe” was one of the proposals submitted by the Narodist to the governor of Galicia in the fall of 1890. However, a serious obstacle to the arrival of a prominent historian in Lviv was his affiliation with the Orthodox denomination (in the eyes of Austrian and Polish politicians, Orthodoxy was associated with the Russian imperial idea, and the deliberate change of Catholicism to Orthodoxy testified against it). In March 1892, the Austrian emperor gave permission for the creation of the chair, but after some hesitation, Antonovych refused the new position. Even trips to Kyiv in early 1893 by the editor of the newspaper Dilo, I. Beley, and O. Barvinsky to negotiate with him did not help (Raikivsky, 2016, p. 84).

Due to his deteriorating health, in January-May 1897 V. B. Antonovych went to Italy for treatment, while simultaneously receiving a research assignment to work in the Vatican archives.

After returning to Kyiv, the scientist was constantly ill, no longer able to teach, and therefore spent almost all his time at home. In 1902, the Russian Imperial Academy elected him a corresponding member. In January 1903, the tsarist government recognized his merits for the last time by awarding him the Order of Stanisław I degree (right there, p. 55).

Despite his illness, V. B. Antonovych did not stop his participation in political life. In particular, at that time he, together with O. Konysky, considered the idea of creating a non-partisan organization that could revive the Ukrainian national idea. With V. B. Antonovych’s active assistance, a secret organization was founded in 1897, which was later called the Society of Ukrainian Progressives and later became the main center of cultural, national, and socio-political thought in Ukraine (Antonovych, 1995, p. 172).

It should be noted that university science remained almost the only bridgehead for the legal defense of the rights of the Ukrainian people, including their own history, language and literature. Scientific activity for the benefit of Ukraine was chosen by V.B. Antonovych consciously, because university professorship opened up the widest opportunities for him of all available at that time. Moreover, university science was a kind of protection for the scientist and opened up the possibility of at least partial legal implementation of his plans. The position of professor at the University of St. Volodymyr. provided not only a certain protection due to prestige, social status, the possibility of career growth, a decent salary and pension, but also provided the possibility of carrying out scientific research and publishing their results, traveling for scientific purposes abroad and receiving from there, without review by a censor, literature and correspondence. Thus, V. B. Antonovych had opportunities, albeit limited, legally, with the help of science, to protect Ukrainian interests and the language of his native people.

It was science that completed the formation of V. B. Antonovych's worldview orientations, and the ethnic Pole-Catholic is undergoing evolution: from a participant in the Polish national liberation struggle to khomanism and Orthodoxy, and then becomes the leader of the Ukrainian community movement, the creator of the newest national ideology. Undoubtedly, V. B. Antonovych's historical studies were focused on Ukrainian studies. The scientist's main task was to prove the right of Ukrainians to their own national past, which contradicted the traditions of Polish historiography, which considered the history of the Right Bank as an integral part of its own political interests and historical memory. Due to a number of historical issues of the Ukrainian people, V. B. Antonovych was most interested in Polish-Ukrainian relations, trying to objectively depict the role that Poland played on Ukrainian lands. V. B. Antonovych condemned the historical policy of Poland on Ukrainian lands, and was hostile to the domination of the Polish nobility over the Ukrainian people. The scientist debunked theories about the cultural mission that the Polish nobility supposedly performed in Ukraine, about the spread of Western civilization among the Ukrainian peasantry, about the legendary heroic defense of Ukrainian lands against the onslaught of steppe hordes, etc. (Korduba, 1928, p. 158).

It is clear that V.B. Antonovych's study of the past of the Right Bank from the point of view of the Ukrainian historical process encountered opposition from Polish intellectuals, which started a long Polish-Ukrainian historiographical debate. Its result was the destruction of the common Eastern European narrative and its division into conflicting Polish and Ukrainian historiographies.

The basis of V. B. Antonovych's historiosophy was that each nation in its political life has its own leading idea, which depends on anthropological racial reasons, on external conditions, territorial circumstances, historical life, and cultural development (right there, p. 159). At the same time, in contrast to the absolutism of their Eastern neighbors and the aristocracy of their Western neighbors, Ukrainians profess the principle of democracy. The difficulty of its implementation lies in the need for a high political culture in general, the lack of which had a fatal effect on the course of the Ukrainian historical process. It was this circumstance that determined the cultural emphasis of all public work of the founder of the Kyiv community. For V. B. Antonovych, the main content of the historical process was the struggle of all factors that influence the realization of the leading idea by the people. It was the scientist who, for the first time in Ukrainian historical culture, called for the study of this struggle and tracing its consequences for all social strata. Therefore, it is the social struggle that should be the focus of research attention; in this case, history appears as "the science of society and the relations between the strata into which society is divided" (right there, p. 160). In such circumstances, the intrinsic value of the state is lost, as it appears as an institution alien to the national nature of Ukrainians.



Understanding the ideological genesis of such views of V. B. Antonovych, researchers point to the influence of the ideologues of French rationalism and positivism, as well as the anarchist school of Proudhon. In particular, M. Slavinsky clarifies: “Out of all historians, Antonovych most loved and respected his older contemporary Augustin Thierry, considering himself his student in terms of the methodology of historical work and the way of presenting the results obtained by that work. Indeed, his works, in the manner of writing and processing the material, will remind Thierry. Especially... his writing style: short, precise, crystal clear, without greedy flourishes and decorations. He recommended Thierry to all his students as an example, and said: – Do not write a single word when it is not based on the studied material. Do not draw any conclusions higher than the established facts, do not take the word of any of the authors, even our chronicles, write briefly and clearly so that even a child can understand” (2002, p. 215). V. B. Antonovych’s historiosophy is connected with his ideas about the unity of human civilization, about its general “products (science, art, etc.). According to the scientist, the history of mankind was divided into the era of “state of nature” and “civil society”. The purpose of human existence was recognized as a pleasant and reasonable life, which consists in satisfying all human needs and which harmonizes with nature. The general law of progressive development of history (V. B. Antonovych rejected the possibility of regression) consists, in his opinion, in the movement of people towards “freedom”, and the meaning of “freedom” itself is enriched: moral and material goods increase and become more complicated, their distribution improves, more people become educated, etc. (Bilodid, 2011, p. 6). Since the conditions and center of human life are the question of food, the laws of society are mainly concerned with the “distribution of food”; but “food conditions”, questions about “bread for one” do not explain the whole story; the number of earthly needs useful for man also includes “needs of the head and heart” (needs of culture) and “vital political affairs”, especially issues of the political and legal system (right there, p. 7).

V. B. Antonovych developed a methodology that made it possible to cover the historical process in its natural (ethnic) and social dimensions. The people are socially divided into estates, strata, classes, but ethno-nationally they are a whole. And precisely as ethno-national integrity, as, in the terms of V. B. Antonovych, “ethnographic individuality”, “national personality”, the people appear as the true subject of history. According to the scientist, there is only one way and vector of development that is natural and normal for a nation – on the basis and in the key of its ethno-national type. Let us note that, as with all Ukrainian intellectuals of the mid-XIXth century, in V. B. Antonovych democracy is merged with socialism, but socialist ideas (questions about the socio-economic situation of the peasants, about relations between workers and capitalists, about capital and labor, questions about community, etc.) were of great importance to him, unlike the enlighteners of the XVIII century (right there, p. 7–8).

Accepting the ideas of the Enlightenment, V.B.Antonovych associated the suffering of mankind with the underdevelopment of general philosophical concepts, the dominance of superstitions, with ignorance and ignorance, and the successes of mankind, the progress of historical life, with the progress of knowledge. At the same time, the scientist placed knowledge in dependence on life, and the morality of society in dependence on the “question of food”, which introduced sociological realism into his concept (right there, p. 9).

Being convinced that “moral strength” makes a person a person, V. B. Antonovych paid considerable attention to ethical issues. He built the “Code of Human Duties” based on the properties and needs of human nature, defended an optimistic view of a dignified life and death as an inevitable, natural and reasonable end of life. V. B. Antonovych claimed that the doctrine of free will is a pure fantasy, at the same time he appreciated the volitional capabilities of a person to influence social life (Antonovych, 1991, p. 11–12).

V. B. Antonovych's philosophical journalism is largely devoted to his excursions into the history of philosophy and criticism of contemporary philosophical movements, his defense of rationalist, empirical, and materialist concepts, and his criticism of the idealistic, mystical, and metaphysical concepts of the so-called "old philosophers." Instead, V. B. Antonovych supported the philosophy of the enlightenment, whose successors were Feuerbach, Focht, Lewis, and others.

The century that has passed since V. B. Antonovych's death has highlighted the essential features of Ukrainians and Russians even more vividly. Ukrainians have chosen liberal democracy as a model of state and social order for their people. Russia, as history and modernity show, has followed the authoritarian model of social and political system. Moreover, Russians evaluate the Ukrainian way of life as wrong, considering Ukrainian statehood "an illogical step and a mistake in history." This conclusion is evidenced by the fact that the Russian people demonstrate a high level of support for Putin's policies and see nothing wrong with military aggression against Ukraine.

It is well known that the Slavophiles justified the imperial status by appropriating the political, cultural, and spiritual heritage of Rus'. The thesis of Rus-Muscovy continuity justified the legitimization of territorial conquests and the credibility of the Moscow state through the antiquity, glory, and greatness of Kyiv. However, as V. B. Antonovych pointed out, Ukrainians with their original language and culture, as well as their unwillingness to dissolve into the Russian imperial identity, were in the way (Antonovych, 1991, p. 181). On the one hand, the Slavophiles protested the existence of the Ukrainian language, which they sought to turn into a dialect of the Great Russian language, and on the other hand, they excluded Ukrainians from the history of Rus, in particular by supporting M. Pogodin's scheme.

V. B. Antonovych opposed the national limitations of the Slavophiles in interpreting history. The scientist defended the idea of Russia's "middle" position between the West and the East, Europe and Asia, the predominance of the Eastern element over the Western, as well as the idea of the "external", shallow nature of the development of the achievements of European civilization since the reforms of Peter the Great, the predominance of the state and the state spirit over society in Russian history. V. B. Antonovych advocated the comprehensive "Europeanization" of the country, by which he meant not all Western European, but only universal principles of civilization and culture (right there, p. 188).

According to V. B. Antonovych, the historical process in Ukraine is centered on the people's struggle for existence. According to the scientist, the historical process is a confrontation of individual forces and factors, and for him, history is the science of society. The national idea is a constant factor in the historical development of a nation. The implementation of any idea of a nation is necessary in order to guarantee the independent political existence of this nation (right there, p. 188-189).

An important element in V. B. Antonovych's views on the nature of the state organization of Rus' is his attitude to the theory of "tribal life", which reflects the Slavophile trend of thought that prevailed in the historiography of the time, represented by the works of G. Evers, K. Kavelin, and S. Solovyov. Analyzing this theory, V. B. Antonovych came close to the theses of Slavophilism regarding the dependence of the theory on Western European influences. In his preparatory notes for his lecture course, Antonovych develops the main point of K. Aksakov's statement that there were no clans in Slavic history. V. B. Antonovych considered the absence of clan order among the Slavs to be proof of the absence of terms of clan life in the language and, in general, of any convincing facts in its favor in the history of Rus. On the contrary, he believes that the Slavs' family passes into the land and the veche. The concept of "land" is identified by V. B. Antonovych with "community", in which he sees an element of the originality of ancient Russian history (Morozov, 2009, p. 239).

Arguing for the dominance of public self-government in Rus', V. B. Antonovych pointed out that, for example, the legend of the founding of Kyiv by three brothers proves that they divided the city into three parts and ruled it in a coordinated manner. The scientist also believed that all Slavic territorial structures consisted of communities whose representatives gathered the people at a *veche*. In addition, V. B. Antonovych believed that the social and property equality of men and women among the Slavs in the pre-Christian period, as well as the limited prerogatives of princely power to the function of defense and collection of public treasury, proved the superiority of the "community principle" over kinship relations.

It should be noted that for V. B. Antonovych, the very question of the community as a form of Slavic life turned it into an abstract and extra-historical phenomenon. According to the scientist, the Prussian community is a form of social organization of a certain order, not just a production and household public union, but an abstract idea of public solidarity, turning into a union of people without a specific political goal. In V. B. Antonovych's historical conception, the Prussian people were the bearers of fair social democratic principles that ran through the entire Old Rus historical process (right there, p. 240).

V. B. Antonovych's position on the Ukrainian question was greatly influenced by the ideas of the Cyril and Methodius, who made a strong impression primarily with their ideas of autonomy and federalism and their views on the restructuring of social and political relations in Eastern European life. The comprehension and acceptance of the ideas of Cyril and Methodius can be considered a turning point in the formation of V. Antonovych's national and political doctrine. Its main motives are: federalism in national affairs, democracy, brought to the absolute will of the individual and the community, ethical and cultural idealism. Having a certain national ideology, in the early 60s V. B. Antonovych began to develop the history of Ukraine. This decision was finally made by him under the influence of prominent figures of Ukrainian historical science of the time – M. Maksymovych, M. Kostomarov and M. Ivanishev. It was they who embodied in the Ukrainian historiography of the time the direction that emerged on the basis of the national romantic upsurge that characterized the Ukrainian national revival of the primitive era.

On the basis of romantic nationalism, supported by the philosophy of Schellingianism and Slavophilism, M. Maksymovych introduced several important ideas to Ukrainian scholarship of the time, which were accepted and later elaborated on in his works by V. Antonovych. Among them is the understanding of the people as a category whose evolution provides a firm guiding line and is the starting point of any historical research. An important position of M. Maksymovych, which was fully assimilated by V. Antonovych, was the concept of Kyiv-centrism and the idea of the inseparability of the Ukrainian past. However, having formulated these provisions, M. Maksymovych did not identify a specific national idea in his work, limiting himself to simple "Little Russian sympathies." Therefore, in the author's opinion, in the component of the national Ukrainian ideology with its adaptation to the practical needs of scientific activity, V. B. Antonovych, when he began to develop the history of Ukraine, could only rely on M. Kostomarov, who in the early 60s of the nineteenth century was already a famous historian. By comparing the theoretical generalizations of M. Kostomarov and V. Antonovych, the section argues that V. Antonovych adopted from his predecessor the theory of federalism, the idealization of the *veche* forms of ancient Russian history, the approach to Ukrainian history through the prism of such a phenomenon as the Cossacks, and ethnopsychological motivation in determining East Slavic relations.

As the Ukrainian historian O. Yas rightly notes, it can be recognized that "V. Antonovych's historical views and worldview combine various elements: intuitive (late romanticism), analytical (early positivism, enlightened rationalism), and pragmatic (cultural program of the Ukrainian national movement) components. Yet, despite their different stylistic nature, they are

quite harmoniously integrated around his social ideal as complementary rather than conflicting components. This combination allowed the historian to avoid a number of stylistic extremes of positivism, in particular, to avoid being captured by pure factualism and to get rid of the grip of total determinism. However, this combination created the phenomenon of the duality of V. Antonovych's image in twentieth-century Ukrainian historiography, which appears either as an objectivist-documentarian or as a synthetic-conceptualist" (2010, p. 891–892).

The merits of V. B. Antonovych to the Ukrainian nation are the populist ideology, which became a reference point for Ukrainian social movements and organizations; the formation of a new socio-political force of the Ukrainian people – the Ukrainian intelligentsia from among scientists, teachers, students and workers in the intellectual sphere; development of a formula for solving the Polish-Ukrainian antagonism, the essence of which is the demonstration of goodwill by the Poles in relation to Ukrainian hopes and interests; promotion of the idea of equal distancing of the Ukrainian nation from Moscow and Warsaw; justification of the need to overcome the cultural backwardness of the Ukrainian people for its self-preservation and revival; revealing the negative role of the Russian language and culture for the revival of Ukrainianness and the prospect of involving compatriots in the values of European civilization; active promotion of the idea of Ukrainian unity and synchronization of the processes of cultural revival and formation of Ukrainian national consciousness in Galicia and Trans-Dnieper Ukraine.

**Conclusions and Prospects for Further Research.** Thus, analyzing the personality of V. B. Antonovych, it is necessary to note his democracy, active political and public activities, inseparable connection with the people, and the desire to influence the consciousness of Ukrainian society with the aim of enlightenment. The scientist always emphasized determination and courage as the main traits of a person that allowed him to become a Ukrainian democratic figure, despite his Polish roots. The main postulate of V. B. Antonovych's life was the idea expressed by him in his "Confessions" that "he has no right to serve the gentry, which lives off of Ukrainian boys and despises them, because he must bring his love and his strength to the people among whom and on whose labor he and his family live" (Antonovych, 1995, p. 114).

In the same way, in the scientific and journalistic opposition to the ideas of Slavophilism, V. B. Antonovych appears as a symbolic figure of the Ukrainian national revival in the second half. XIX – at the beginning of the XX century. Including in the debates with supporters of Slavophilism, the views of the scientist on the essential features, as well as the nature and content of the relationship between the Ukrainian and Russian nations are revealed. V. B. Antonovych constantly proved to Slavophiles that Ukrainians are a separate, self-sufficient people with their own history, language and culture, and he considered any unification of Ukraine with Muscovy to be a misfortune for Ukraine and a source of its national oppression. Subsequently, the researcher's views on the Ukrainian historical and political process accumulated various historiographical traditions and approaches, while being completely exceptional and unique. Thus, V. B. Antonovych contributed to the processes of national self-identification of the Ukrainian people, the formation of self-awareness of Ukrainians and became the pride of national science.

## REFERENCES

- Antonovych, V. B. (1995). *Moya spovid'. Vybrani istorychni ta publicy'stychni tvory*. Ky'yiv.: Ly'bid'. [in Ukrainian]
- Antonovych, V. B. (1991). *Prokozacz'kichasy'na Ukrayini*. Pislyam. M. F. Slaboshpy'cz'kogo; Koment.: O. D. Vasy'lyuk, I. B. Gy'ry'ch. Ky'yiv: Dnipro. [in Ukrainian]

- Veremny`ch, Ya. (2016). *Konstruyuvannya ukrayins`koyi identy`chnosti: nacional`ni i regional`ni proyekty` drugoyi polovy`ny` XIX – pochatku XX stolittya*. Ky`yiv: Insty`tut istoriyi Ukrayiny` NAN Ukrayiny`. [in Ukrainian].
- Drahomanov, M. (1970). Avstro-ruski spomyny (1867–1877). *Drahomanov M. Literaturno-publitsystychni pratsi : u 2 t., T. 2*. [in Ukrainian]
- Yefremov S. (1925). Pered sudom vlasnoyi sovisti. Gromads`ka i polity`chna robota V. Antonovy`cha. *Zapy`sky` istoriy`ko-filologichnogo viddilu VUAN*, 1, 10. [in Ukrainian]
- Ency`klopediya istoriyi Ukrayiny` : V 10 t. T. 1. Ky`yiv: Nauk. dumka, 2003. [in Ukrainian]
- Kiyan, O. (2005). *Volody`my`r Antonovy`ch: istoriy`kjorganizator “Ky`yivs`koyi istoriy`chnoyi shkoly`”*. Ky`yiv: Insty`tut istoriyi Ukrayiny` NAN Ukrayiny`. [in Ukrainian]
- Kiyan, O. (2011). Polemika navkolo naukovoї spadshchyny Volodymyra Antonovycha v ukrains`kii istoriohrafii radianskoi doby. *Naukovi zapysky [Kirovohradskoho derzhavnogo pedahohichnogo universytetu imeni Volodymyra Vynnychenka]*. Seriiia : *Istorychni nauky*, 14, 214–224. [in Ukrainian]
- Korduba, M. (1928). Volodymyr Antonovych. *Literaturno-naukovi visnyk. T. KHSVI. Kn. VI.*, 156–167. [in Ukrainian]
- Korotkyi, V. A. (2019). Naukova polemika khlopomana Volodymyra Antonovycha – instrumentarii zakhystu prav ukrainskoi movy i literatury. *Bibliotekarz Podlaski*, 1, 9–23. [in Ukrainian]
- Kruglashov, A. Drama intelektual`na: polity`chni ideyi M. Dragomanova. Chernivci: Prut, 2001. [in Ukrainian]
- Krupnytskyi, B. (1959). *Istoriioznavchi problemy istorii Ukrainy*. Miunkhen. [in Ukrainian]
- Lotocz`ky`j, O. (1933). *Storinky` my`nulogo*. Varshava. [in Ukrainian]
- Morozov D. (2009). Volody`my`r Antonovy`ch pro centralizm i federalizaciyu Ky`yivs`koyi Rusi. *Naukovi zapy`sky` Kirovograds`kogo derzhavnogo pedagogichnogo universy`tetu imeni Volody`my`ra Vy`nny`chenka. Seriya : Istory`chni nauky`*, 12, 237–243. [in Ukrainian]
- Mudryi, M. (2003). Formuvannia novochasnoi natsionalno-politychnoi kultury ukrainskoho suspilstva Halychyny (problema zovnishnikh modelei). *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Seriiia istorychna*, 38, 140–142. [in Ukrainian]
- Raikivskyi, I.IA. (2016). Volodymyr Antonovych i Halychyna. *Halychyna*, 28, 73–90. [in Ukrainian]
- V. Korotky`j, V. Ul`yanovs`ky`j (1997). Sy`n Ukrayiny` : Volody`my`r Bonifatijovy`ch Antonovy`ch: u 3.t. Kyiv : Zapovit. [in Ukrainian]
- Slavinskyi, M. (2002). *Zakhovaiu v sertsii Ukrainu: poeziia, publitsystyka, spohady*. Kyiv. Yunivers. [in Ukrainian]
- Soxan`, P. (1996). Arxeografichna diyal`nist` V. B. Antonovy`cha v konteksti nacional`nogo suspil`no-polity`chnogo zhy`ttya Ukrayiny`. *Tretya Akademiya pam`yati Volody`my`ra Antonovy`cha. Dopovidi ta materialy*. Kyiv, 17-27. [in Ukrainian]
- Ul`yanovs`ky`j, V.I., Korotky`j, V.A. (1997). *Volody`my`r Antonovy`ch: Obraz na tli epoxy`*. Ky`yiv: Mizhnar. fin. agenciya. [in Ukrainian]
- Figurny`j, Yu.S. (2008). Ty tan ukrayins`kogo nacional`nogo vidrodzhennya – etnociotvorcha ta etnografichna diyal`nist` Volody`my`ra Antonovy`cha v ukrayinoznavchomu vy`miri (do stolitnix rokov`x jogo smerti). *Zbirny`k naukovy`x prac` Naukovo-doslidnogo insty`tut ukrayinoznavstva. T. XIX.*, 109–137. [in Ukrainian]
- Yas, O.V. (2010). Nezvychainyi pozytyvist Volodymyr Antonovych. *Ukraina kriz viky: Zbirnyk nauk. prats na poshanu akademika NAN Ukrainy profesora V. Smoliia*. Kyiv, 863–892. [in Ukrainian]